



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/645,128

08/21/2003

Timothy J. Chainer

YOR903282US1

7120

23405

7590

12/23/2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI PC
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER

CHONG CRUZ, NADJA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/645,128	Applicant(s) CHAINER ET AL.	
	Examiner NADJA CHONG CRUZ	Art Unit 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 12 and 19-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-12 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This is a Final office action in reply to the response filed on 24 September 2008.
2. Claims 1-9 and 19 have been amended.
3. Claims 10, 13-18 and 22-48 have been canceled.
4. Claims 1-9, 11-12 and 19-21 are currently pending and have been examined.
5. The rejections of claims 1-9, 11-12 and 19-21 have been updated to reflect the amendments.

Response to Amendment

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.
7. The rejection of claims 3, 23 and 37 under 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments.
8. The rejection of claims 30 and 33 under 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments.
9. The rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 USC § 101 is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments received on 24 September 2008 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
11. With regards to claims 1 and 19, Applicant argues that the prior art of record, specifically that Lenny fails to describe, teach or suggest (1) *collecting data for a plurality of products, and in particular, for a plurality of products in which one of the products is local to a given product user and one of the products is global to that product user and receiving information about the product from another user in order to analyze that information, along with information local to the product user* (Page 8, first Paragraph) and that Gray fails to describe, teach or suggest (2) *analyzing data*

from a plurality of products, both local and global, and providing a summary of that analysis to the interested entity (page 8, third paragraph).

12. With regards to claim 4, Applicant argues that (3) *[n]either Lenny nor Gray describes the regrouping of products based on an analysis performed on a plurality of products including those that are local and global* (page 9, first paragraph).
13. With regards to claims 5 and 6, Applicant argues that (4) *there is no discussion in Lenny or Gray of regrouping of products or prioritizing products based on a grouping criterion and the summary* (page 9, second paragraph).
14. In response to arguments 1 and 2. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lenny teaches that “[t]he Critical Event Log allows the engineers to obtain a report of each disc drive.” (e.g., data collected from a plurality of products) (Lenny, ¶ 0038) where Lenny teaches that at least one product of the plurality of products (e.g., each disc drive) is local to one product user (e.g., the engineers). Gray teaches in Figure 3a “On-line Computer(s) with drivers to be tested” (e.g., analyzing data from a plurality of products) through a network “on-line computers” (e.g., both local and global) and the “[t]est data may then be periodically transmitted, e.g., e-mailed, to the central site for diagnosis, step 4. When anomalies are detected and diagnosed alarm notices and the diagnostic drive reliability trend chart” (e.g., a summary of the analysis) “(FIG. 9) may be transmitted, e.g., e-mailed, to the computer user” (e.g., provided to the interest entity) “along with suggested solution such as backup up data on the suspect disk and upgrade the reliability of the disk drive, step 5.” (Gray, column 11, lines 51-60). Further, In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *receiving information about the product from another user in order to analyze that information, along with information local to the product user*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

15. In response to arguments 3 and 4. Examiner respectfully disagrees; this argument is moot for the following reasons: claims 4-6 have been rejected on new grounds in light of Applicant's amendment. Please see the rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-12 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lenny et al (US 2002/0060868 A1) hereinafter "Lenny" in view of Gray et al (US 6,249,887 B1) hereinafter "Gray".

Claim 1:

Lenny as shown discloses a method of facilitating provision of product usage information, the method comprising:

- *automatically obtaining, by a processor, product usage information generated by a plurality of products, used in real-time, non-test environments* (pages 3, ¶ 0028 and page 4, ¶ 0034: which teaches that "collecting the disc drive attributes" (e.g., product usage information), where Lenny teaches that SMART is a tool that automatically obtain disc drive attributes (e.g., product usage information generated by a plurality of products) "and analyzing them while the disc drive is in normal use" (e.g., used in real-time, non-test environment). Further, " SMART monitors a series of attributes that are indicators of an electronic or mechanical component failure. These attributes are chosen specifically for each individual disc drive model,

because drive architectures vary from one model to another” (e.g., a plurality of products));

- *wherein at least one product of the plurality of products is local to one product user* (¶ 0038, which teaches that “[t]he Critical Event Log allows the engineers to obtain a report of each disc drive.” Lenny teaches that at least one product of the plurality of products (e.g., each disc drive) is local to one product user (e.g., the engineers));
- *and wherein the plurality of products include autonomic logic and wherein the automatically obtaining is independent of product user input* (page 3 ¶ 0029-0030: which teaches that “[t]he host computer polls the disc drive on a regular basis to check the status” (e.g., automatically obtaining is independent of product user input) “of this “report status” command, and if the command signals imminent failure, the host computer sends an alarm to the end user or the system administrator” where “[m]ost of the programming for the SMART technology resides in the disc drive firmware 145.” Lenny teaches that the plurality of products (e.g., different disc drive models) include autonomic logic (e.g., software));
- *analyzing by the processor the obtained product usage information generated from the plurality of products to obtain an analysis* (¶ 0034 and 0038, which Lenny teaches that “[s]MART was developed as a tool for predicting a disc drive failure by collecting the disc drive attributes and analyzing them while the disc drive is in normal use” based on the collected product usage information, “[t]he Critical Event Log allows the engineers to obtain a report” (e.g., an analysis) “of each disc drive.”);

Lenny teaches that “[t]he Critical Event Log allows the engineers to obtain a report” (e.g., an analysis) “of each disc drive.”(Lenny, ¶ 0038). Lenny does not specifically teach the following limitations. However, Gray in an analogous art of supplying product usage information for the purpose of providing a summary of the analysis to at least one interested entity (i.e., local or global) (column 11, lines 51-60) as shown does:

- *and at least one product of the plurality of products is global to the one product user* (column 11-12, lines 65-67 and 1-2, respectively and Figure 3a, which it illustrates the relationship between a central computer and a remote units under test, where the central computer provides the application to monitor each disk drive, which is “useful for hard disk manufacturers (e.g., each disk drive is global to the one product user) “as it allows them to ascertain certain read standards for factory fresh disks which may be compared to data generated by periodically testing the disk to more accurately monitor the useful life of the disk”);
- *and automatically providing a summary of the analysis to at least one interested entity to determine whether a change is to be made to the plurality of products or future products* (column 11, lines 51-60: which teaches that “[t]est data may then be periodically transmitted, e.g., e-mailed, to the central site for diagnosis, step 4. When anomalies are detected and diagnosed alarm notices and the diagnostic drive reliability trend chart” (e.g., a summary of the analysis) “(FIG. 9) may be transmitted, e.g., e-mailed, to the computer user along with suggested solutions” (e.g., to determine whether a change is to be made) “such as backup up data on the suspect disk and upgrade the reliability of the disk drive, step 5.” Where Gray teaches that after performing a monitoring test, a summary of the analysis (e.g., diagnosed alarm notices and the diagnostic drive reliability trend chart) are send to a computer user (e.g., interested entity) automatically);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the critical event log for a disk drive of Lenny with the apparatus and method for predicting failure of a disk drive as taught by Gray because “disk drive warranty providers can use it to provide replace-before-failure warrantees, an upgrade of their present replace-after-failure (and loss of user data) warrantees.” Furthermore, it “reminds PC users when their disk

drive should be replaced and presents the users with corrective options which may be conveniently investigated and ordered over the network.” (Gray, column 4 lines 29-36).

Claim 2:

Lenny as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the automatically obtaining comprises automatically forwarding, by the plurality of products, the product usage information, wherein the plurality of products monitor one or more parameters of the plurality of products* (¶ 0029 and 0038: which teaches that “[s]MART generates alarm signals (e.g., in response to SMART "report status" command), and the software on the host computer 140 interprets the alarm signals. The host computer polls the disc drive on a regular basis to check the status” (e.g., monitoring) “of this "report status" command, and if the command signals imminent failure,” (e.g., product usage information) “the host computer sends an alarm” (e.g., automatically forward) “to the end user or the system administrator.” Lenny teaches that SMART monitors the disk drive attributes and forward the product usage information with disk drive monitoring data to the end user or the system administrator in order to analyze this information to create backup of data or replacement of the disc drive, based on the collected product usage information, “[t]he Critical Event Log allows the engineers to obtain a report of each disc drive.” (e.g., a plurality of products));

Claim 3:

Lenny as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *providing the summary of the analysis to a product receiver related to the plurality of products* (¶ 0038: which teaches that “[t]he Critical Event Log 121 contains historical information of the disc drive. All events, errors, and/or any disc drive operational information that are useful for failure analysis of a disc drive are stored in the Critical Event Log 121” where Lenny teaches that Critical Event log (e.g., a

product receiver) receive the summary of the analysis related to the plurality of products (e.g., each disc drive));

Lenny does not specifically teach the following limitation. However, Gray in an analogous art of supplying product usage information for the purpose of using a summary of the analysis to effect one or more changes of one or more products (column 11, lines 51-60) as shown does:

- *and using the summary of the analysis to effect one or more changes of one or more products of the plurality of products* (column 11, lines 51-60, which teaches that “[w]hen anomalies are detected and diagnosed alarm notices and the diagnostic drive reliability trend chart” (e.g., a summary of the analysis) “(FIG. 9) may be transmitted, e.g., e-mailed, to the computer user along with suggested solutions” (e.g., to effect one or more changes of one or more products) “such as backup up data on the suspect disk and upgrade the reliability of the disk drive, step 5.”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the summary of the analysis to effect one or more changes of one or more products of the plurality of products as taught by Gray, to improve Lenny, thereby giving the predictable result of allowing “hard disk manufacturers” “to ascertain certain read standards for factory fresh disks which may be compared to data generated by periodically testing the disk to more accurately monitor the useful life of the disk. (Gray, columns 11-12, lines 66-67 to 1-2).

With regards to the limitations of **claim 4**: *using the summary to regroup a number of the products of the plurality of products*, **claim 5**: *using a grouping criterion, as well as the summary, to regroup the number of products* and **claim 6**: *prioritizing the number of products and using the priority of the number of products, the grouping criterion and the summary to regroup the number of products*. Lenny teaches that “[t]he Critical Event Log allows the engineers to obtain a report” (e.g., an analysis) “of each disc drive” (Lenny, ¶ 0038). Gray teaches “[w]hen anomalies are detected and diagnosed alarm notices and the diagnostic drive reliability trend chart” (e.g., a

summary of the analysis) "(FIG. 9) may be transmitted, e.g., e-mailed, to the computer user along with suggested solutions". (Gray, column 11, lines 51-60). Both, Lenny and Gray teaches the use of a summary of the analysis based on the data collected to analyze each disc performance in order to determine possible disk failures and malfunctions. Lenny and Gray does not specifically disclose the above limitations, however Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the regroup and classification art to create a sub-group (e.g., regroup) based on data previously provided (e.g., a summary of the analysis), a grouping criterion (e.g., categories, descriptions) and to rank or weight a priority factor in order to determine and create a sub-group (e.g., regroup) from another group. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to regroup and classify a number of products based on a grouping criterion and priorities as taught by the old and well-known practice of regrouping and classifying products, to improve Lenny and Gray, thereby giving the predictable result of determining a sub-group of products to be improved.

Claim 7:

Lenny does not specifically teach the following limitation. However, Gray in an analogous art of supplying product usage information for the purpose of automatically receiving information (Figures 3a and 7) as shown does:

- *automatically receiving information relating to the summary of the analysis from the at least one interested entity* (Figures 3a and 7, which Figure 3 illustrates that in 4. Diagnostic Analysis, information is automatically received (e.g., a summary of the analysis: calibration and probability) from a individual computers' (e.g., interested entity) disk drive data as shown in Figure 7 when a disk drive is connected to the Central Computer via a network);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the critical event log for a disk drive of Lenny with the apparatus and method for predicting failure of a disk drive as taught by Gray because "disk drive warranty providers can

use it to provide replace-before-failure warrantees, an upgrade of their present replace-after-failure (and loss of user data) warrantees.” Furthermore, it “reminds PC users when their disk drive should be replaced and presents the users with corrective options which may be conveniently investigated and ordered over the network.” (Gray, column 4 lines 29-36).

Claim 8:

Lenny as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *analyzing by the at least one interested entity at least one of the summary and data related to the plurality of products obtained by the at least one interested entity* (¶ 0038: which teaches that “[t]he Critical Event Log allows the engineers to obtain a report of each disc drive. The report would show what happened to the disc drive prior to the failure.” Where Lenny teaches that an engineer (e.g., one interested entity) analyze a report which includes a summary of the analysis based on the information obtained from each disc drive);
- *and providing data to a product receiver of the plurality of products based on the analyzing* (¶ 0038: which teaches that “[t]he Critical Event Log 121 contains historical information of the disc drive. All events, errors, and/or any disc drive operational information that are useful for failure analysis of a disc drive are stored in the Critical Event Log 121” where Lenny teaches that Critical Event log (e.g., a product receiver) receive data of the plurality of products (e.g., each disc drive) based on the analyzing);

Claim 9:

Lenny does not specifically teach the following limitation. However, Gray in an analogous art of supplying product usage information for the purpose of automatically effecting a modification to a product (column 11, lines 7-11) as shown does:

- *automatically effecting a modification to a product under test, in response to the analyzing* (column 11, lines 7-11: which teaches that “each warning signal maybe

automatically dispatched directly to the user, to authorized computer repair personnel, to the drive manufacturer and/or to any other desired recipient". Gray teaches that in response to the analyzing, a warning signal is automatically sent. It is implicitly disclosed that after receiving a signal a modification is made to a product under test by the user or a computer repair personnel);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the critical event log for a disk drive of Lenny with the apparatus and method for predicting failure of a disk drive as taught by Gray because "disk drive warranty providers can use it to provide replace-before-failure warrantees, an upgrade of their present replace-after-failure (and loss of user data) warrantees." Furthermore, it "reminds PC users when their disk drive should be replaced and presents the users with corrective options which may be conveniently investigated and ordered over the network." (Gray, column 4 lines 29-36).

Claim 11:

Lenny as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the at least one interested entity comprises at least one of a designer, a creator, a developer, a constructor, an integrator* (§ 0035: which teaches that "an engineer conducting the failure analysis would require information that shows what happened to the disc drive while the disc drive was in normal operation" where Lenny teaches that an engineer (e.g., a designer, a creator, a developer) performs an analysis and develop improvements based on information provided from the disk drives);

In addition, Gray as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *a manufacturer, and a quality maintainer* (see at least column 11, lines 42-44: which teaches that "[m]ore particularly, a warrantor, maintainer, manufacturer or user of on-line computers" (e.g., interested entity) "may process, at the computer center, test data collected from on-line computers throughout the network.".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the critical event log for a disk drive of Lenny with the apparatus and method for predicting failure of a disk drive as taught by Gray because “disk drive warranty providers can use it to provide replace-before-failure warrantees, an upgrade of their present replace-after-failure (and loss of user data) warrantees.” Furthermore, it “reminds PC users when their disk drive should be replaced and presents the users with corrective options which may be conveniently investigated and ordered over the network.” (Gray, column 4 lines 29-36).

Claim 12:

The combination of Lenny / Gray teaches the limitations of Claim 1, as explained above. Furthermore, Gray as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the one or more products comprise one or more storage devices* (column 11, lines 63-64: which teaches that “to analyze disk drives in all types of computers, including, but no limited to PC’s, and mainframes”. Gray teaches that it analyze more than one disk drives (e.g., one or more storage devices));

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the critical event log for a disk drive of Lenny with the apparatus and method for predicting failure of a disk drive as taught by Gray because “disk drive warranty providers can use it to provide replace-before-failure warrantees, an upgrade of their present replace-after-failure (and loss of user data) warrantees.” Furthermore, it “reminds PC users when their disk drive should be replaced and presents the users with corrective options which may be conveniently investigated and ordered over the network.” (Gray, column 4 lines 29-36).

Claim 19:

The limitations of claim 19 encompass substantially the same scope as claim 1. Accordingly, those similar limitations are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 1, as described above. The following are the limitations of claim 19 that differ from claim 1.

Lenny does not disclose the following limitation, however Gray as shown, does:

- *installing logic on a computer readable medium to be executed by at least one processor, the logic when executed by the at least one processor to* (column 11, lines 23-27: which teaches that “[t]he computer center down loads a small software package” (e.g., logic) “which is automatically installed in the served computer population” (e.g., processing unit) “for the purpose of collecting operational data and transmitting it to the central computer”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the critical event log for a disk drive of Lenny with the apparatus and method for predicting failure of a disk drive as taught by Gray because “disk drive warranty providers can use it to provide replace-before-failure warrantees, an upgrade of their present replace-after-failure (and loss of user data) warrantees.” Furthermore, it “reminds PC users when their disk drive should be replaced and presents the users with corrective options which may be conveniently investigated and ordered over the network.” (Gray, column 4 lines 29-36).

Claim 20:

Lenny as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the logic automatically disseminates data relating to the product usage information* (¶ 0030: which teaches that “[t]he disc drive firmware 145 and/or controller 142 perform most operations for collection and processing of SMART data and post the result to the host computer 140 indicating whether a disc drive failure is imminent” where Lenny teaches that SMART collects and distribute disk drive data (e.g., product usage information) automatically to the host computer);

Claim 21:

Lenny as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the logic automatically analyzes the product usage information* (¶ 0029: which teaches that “[s]MART generates alarm signals (e.g., in response to SMART “report status” command), and the software on the host computer 140 interprets the

alarm signals. The host computer polls the disc drive on a regular basis to check the status of this "report status" command, and if the command signals imminent failure, the host computer sends an alarm to the end user or the system administrator." Where Lenny teaches that the host computer analyze the product usage information every time it check the status of the disk drive);

Conclusion

- 18.** The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- Geller et al., (US 6,236,990 B1) discloses a method and systems for ranking multiple products according to user's preferences.
 - Maxwell (US 6,195,643 B1) discloses an evaluation and decision making systems.
 - Gantenhammer et al., (US 7,089,506 B2) discloses a method for selecting products.

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Nadja Chong** whose telephone number is **570.270.3939**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **BETH BOSWEL** can be reached at **571.272.6737**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Application/Control Number: 10/645,128
Art Unit: 3623

Page 16

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window:**

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

/Nadja Chong/

Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623